

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed 11/09/2004. Upon entry of this response, claims 1-20 remain pending and have not been amended. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested. No new matter has been added to the present application.

Response To Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. Section 102

The Office Action indicates that claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as being unpatentable by US publication 2002/0133540 to Sears, Jr. et al.

In this regard, Applicants submit a Declaration under 37 CFR section 1.131. The Declaration shows that the claimed invention was conceived and was coupled with diligence prior to the effective date of the Sears reference relied on in the Office Action. Sears, therefore, should be withdrawn as a prior art reference.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the 102 rejection.

Response To Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. Section 103

The Office Action indicates that claims 6-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over US publication 2002/0007317 to Callaghan et al in view of Sears, Jr. et al. (US Publication 2002/0133540).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Specifically, since Applicants respectfully assert that Sears may not be properly asserted against the application for at least the reasons indicated above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the 103 rejection.

Applicants also respectfully assert that the Examiner has apparently misread at least the Callaghan application. The Examiner states, for example: "Callaghan et al. teaches a computing device, comprising: means for receiving a first request for a cookie for a cookie that is valid for a first URL from a second WEB client...". It is respectfully asserted that this statement is incorrect. The request that the


Examiner is apparently referring to is a standard GET command (see Callaghan at section 0052) and is not a request for a cookie.

With respect to claim 7, for example, the Examiner states: "Callaghan et al. teaches the computing device of claim 6, wherein the first WEB client and the second WEB client are two different computing devices (Fig. 1)." It is respectfully asserted that this statement is incorrect. Fig. 1 in Callaghan depicts only a single client computer (client 108).

### CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submits that all rejections have been traversed and that the now pending claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (208) 396-5263.

Respectfully submitted,  
Robert E. Haines et al

By   
Matthew L. Wade  
Reg. No. 42,206

Date: 3/1/05  
Telephone: (208) 396-4095  
Fax: (208) 396-3958